

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SCOTT RICHARD PRICE,
Petitioner
v.
WARDEN,
Respondent

No. 2:22-CV-00028-KJM-DMC-P

Petitioner, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, brings this petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2254. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge as provided by Eastern District of California local rules.

On September 27, 2022, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations, which were served on the parties and which contained notice that the parties may file objections within the time specified therein. Timely objections to the findings and recommendations have been filed.

In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Local Rule 304, this court has conducted a *de novo* review of this case. Having reviewed the file, the court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by the proper analysis.

1111

11

1 Pursuant to Rule 11(a) of the Federal Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases, the court has
2 considered whether to issue a certificate of appealability. Before petitioner can appeal this
3 decision, a certificate of appealability must issue. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c); Fed. R. App. P. 22(b).
4 Where the petition is denied on the merits, a certificate of appealability may issue under 28
5 U.S.C. § 2253 “only if the applicant has made a substantial showing of the denial of a
6 constitutional right.” 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). The court must either issue a certificate of
7 appealability indicating which issues satisfy the required showing or must state the reasons why
8 such a certificate should not issue. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 22(b). Where the petition is dismissed on
9 procedural grounds, a certificate of appealability “should issue if the prisoner can show: (1) ‘that
10 jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the district court was correct in its procedural
11 ruling’; and (2) ‘that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the petition states a valid
12 claim of the denial of a constitutional right.’” *Morris v. Woodford*, 229 F.3d 775, 780 (9th Cir.
13 2000) (quoting *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 120 S. Ct. 1595, 1604 (2000)). For the reasons
14 set forth in the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations, the court finds issuance of a
15 certificate of appealability is not warranted in this case.

16 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 17 1. The findings and recommendations filed September 27, 2022, ECF No. 23,
18 are adopted in full;
- 19 2. Respondent’s unopposed motion to dismiss, ECF No. 19, is granted;
20 3. This action is dismissed;
21 4. The court declines to issue a certificate of appealability; and
22 5. The clerk of the court is directed to enter judgment and close this file.

23 DATED: January 12, 2023.

24 
25 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
26
27
28